IN THE DISTRICT COURT OF THE UNITED STATES FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF NORTH CAROLINA ASHEVILLE DIVISION CIVIL CASE NO. 1:09cv181

APRIL HALL STACEY,)
Plaintiff,))
vs.	ORDER
MICHAEL ASTRUE, Commissioner of Social Security)))
Defendant.))

THIS MATTER is before the Court on the parties' cross Motions for Summary Judgment [Docs. 21 and 26], and the Magistrate Judge's Memorandum and Recommendation [Doc. 29] regarding the disposition of those motions.

Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b) and a specific Order of referral of the district court, the Honorable Dennis L. Howell, United States Magistrate Judge, was designated to consider these pending motions in the above-captioned action and to submit to this Court a recommendation for the disposition of these motions.

On January 28, 2011, the Magistrate Judge filed a Memorandum and Recommendation [Doc. 29] in this case containing proposed conclusions of law in support of a recommendation regarding the motions [Docs. 21 and

26]. The parties were advised that any objections to the Magistrate

Judge's Memorandum and Recommendation were to be filed in writing

within fourteen (14) days of service. Plaintiff made a timely motion for a

seven day extension, which was granted. [Doc. 30, text order]. The

extended period within which to file objections has expired, and no written

objections to the Memorandum and Recommendation have been filed.¹

After a careful review of the Magistrate Judge's Recommendation [Doc. 29], the Court finds that the proposed conclusions of law are consistent with current case law. Accordingly, the Court hereby **ACCEPTS** the Magistrate Judge's Recommendation that the Defendant's Motion for Summary Judgment be allowed and that the Plaintiff's Motions for Summary Judgment and to Receive New and Material Evidence be denied.

IT IS, THEREFORE, ORDERED that the Defendant's Motion for Summary Judgment [Doc. 21] is ALLOWED, and that the Plaintiff's Motion for Summary Judgment [Doc. 26] is hereby DENIED.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Signed: March 5, 2011

Martin Reidinger

United States District Judge

¹Plaintiff has similarly failed to comply with the deadlines set by the Court throughout this case. [Docs. 5, 8, 17, 19, 23, 24].